

### REMARKS

Claims 1-39 are pending in the application with claims 1-5 and 36-39 being independent. Claims 1-5 and 32-35 have been amended.

The specification has been amended to correct minor grammatical errors. Figs. 20A, 20B, 21 and 23 have been amended to the extent of adding the legend, "Prior Art," to overcome the drawing objections. No new matter has been added.

Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the Examiner's allowance of claims 32-39.

Claims 1-35 are objected to for minor grammatical informalities. Claims 1-5 and 32-35 have been amended to overcome this objection.

Claims 1-9 and 18-31 have been rejected as being anticipated by Nakamura. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection for the reasons noted below.

Claim 1 recites a digital micromirror device that includes a micromirror located over a first electrode and a second electrode, first and second switching elements, and a SRAM. Claim 1 further recites that outputs of the first and second switching elements are connected, respectively, to the first and second electrodes, that an input of the SRAM is connected to the first electrode, and that an output of the SRAM is connected to the second electrode. This arrangement is shown, for example, in Fig. 3 of the application, where the switching transistor 115a constitutes the first switching element, the erasure transistor 115b constitutes the second switching element, and the SRAM 116 constitutes a separate element.

Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and the claims depending from claim 1 because Nakamura fails to describe or suggest such an arrangement. In particular, Nakamura does not describe or suggest the arrangement of first and second switching elements and an SRAM as recited in claim 1. Instead, Nakamura describes an SRAM 14 that includes a memory cell 14a having a flip-flop with at least two transistors, the outputs of which are connected, respectively, to mirror electrodes 15 and 16. Thus, Nakamura fails to describe or suggest an SRAM and separate switching elements that have outputs connected to the electrodes.

The action improperly equates the recited switching elements with the transistors of the memory cell 14a, and the recited SRAM with the SRAM 14 of which the memory cell 14a is a part. This is improper because the action uses the memory cell 14a to serve as both the switching elements and the SRAM, while the claim clearly recites separate elements.

For at least these reasons, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and the claims depending from claim 1.

Independent claim 2 recites the same arrangement of switching elements and a SRAM as is recited in claim 1. Accordingly, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 2 and the claims depending from claim 2 for the reasons noted above with respect to claim 1.

Each of independent claims 3 and 5 recites a SRAM and first and second switching elements, and further recites that switching of the first switching element is controlled by a first signal and switching of the second switching element is controlled by a second signal. In view of this, two transistors of the same memory cell, which would necessarily be controlled by the same signal, cannot be equated to the recited switching elements. Accordingly, for at least this reason, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 3 and 5 and the claims depending from claims 3 and 5.

Like claim 1, independent claim 4 recites first and second switching elements and a separate SRAM. Accordingly, for at least this reason, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 4 and the claims depending from claim 4.

Claims 10-17 have been rejected as being obvious over Nakamura in view of Maimon. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because Maimon does not remedy the failure of Nakamura to describe or suggest the subject matter of the independent claims.

Applicant : Yamazaki, et al.  
Serial No. : 09/903,783  
Filed : July 11, 2001  
Page : 19 of 19

Attorney's Docket No.: 07977-281001 / US5070/5076

Enclosed is a \$290 check for the Petition for Extension of Time fee (\$110) and the Information Disclosure Statement fee (\$180). Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 15, 2003

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
John F. Hayden  
Reg. No. 37,640

**Customer No. 26171**  
Fish & Richardson P.C.  
1425 K Street, N.W., 11th Floor  
Washington, DC 20005-3500  
Telephone: (202) 783-5070  
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331

40175566.doc